

REMARKS

Claims 1-16 were pending. Claims 7-16 are cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer. Hence, claims 1-6 are pending in the Application. Applicants cancelled claims 7-16 so as to prosecute all the method claims (claims 1-6) in one patent application. Applicants are not conceding in this application that cancelled claims 7-16 are not patentable over the art cited by the Office Action or are directed to non-statutory subject matter. Claims 7-16 were cancelled solely to facilitate expeditious prosecution of the remaining method claims (claims 1-6). Applicants respectfully reserve the right to pursue these (claims 7-16) and other claims in one or more continuation patent applications.

The Specification is objected to. Claims 7-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §101. Claims 7-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph. Claims 1-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b).

Applicants address these objections and rejections below.

I. OBJECTIONS TO THE SPECIFICATION:

The Office Action has objected to the Specification for failing to provide proper antecedent basis for the computer program product claimed in claim 13. Office Action (2/21/2008), page 3. As indicated above, Applicants cancelled claim 13 and hence the objection to the Specification in light of claim 13 is moot. Applicants note that by canceling claims 13-16, Applicants are not conceding in this application that the Specification fails to provide proper antecedent basis for the computer program product claimed in claim 13.

II. REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §101:

The Office Action has rejected claims 7-16 under 35 U.S.C. §101 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter. Office Action (2/21/2008), page 3. As indicated above, Applicants cancelled claims 7-16 and hence the rejections to claims 7-16 are moot. Applicants are not conceding in this application that cancelled claims 7-16 are directed to non-statutory subject matter.

III. REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §112, FIRST PARAGRAPH:

The Office Action has rejected claims 7-16 under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, since the claimed invention is allegedly not supported by either an asserted utility or a well established utility. Office Action (2/21/2008), page 4. As indicated above, Applicants cancelled claims 7-16 and hence the rejections to claims 7-16 are moot. Applicants are not conceding in this application that cancelled claims 7-16 are not supported by utility.

IV. REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §102(b):

The Office Action has rejected claims 1-16 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Choudhry et al. (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0194373) (hereinafter "Choudhry"). As indicated above, Applicants cancelled claims 7-16. Hence, the rejections to claims 7-16 are moot. Applicants will address these rejections in connection with pending claims 1-6.

Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections for at least the reasons stated below and respectfully request the Examiner to reconsider and withdraw these rejections.

For a claim to be anticipated under 35 U.S.C. §102, each and every claim limitation must be found within the cited prior art reference and arranged as required by the claim. M.P.E.P. §2131.

The Office Action cites paragraph [0041] of Choudhry as disclosing "mapping said old URL to a new URL based on a data owner specified mapping accessible from said CGI script" as recited in claim 1. Office Action (2/21/2008), page 4. Applicants respectfully traverse.

Choudhry instead discloses that a script is installed on the Apache HTTP server to intercept the queries to unknown URL's, as defined by the "*" entry in the routing table. [0041]. Choudhry further discloses that, for example, if a web browser requests a URL such as "http://subdomain.domain.com," and it is not recognized by the standard DNS, the Apache server will typically return a "Error 404: File Not Found" page to the web browser. [0041]. Additionally, Choudhry discloses that as shown in Figure 4, when a URL is not recognized (42), it is passed to the script.

[0041]. Further, Choudhry discloses that the script then queries (43) a database of virtual subdomain mappings, and redirects (44) the request to the appropriate subdirectory on a registered domain server. [0041].

Hence, Choudhry discloses that if a URL, which contains a virtual subdomain, is not recognized, then the URL is passed to a script which queries a database of virtual subdomain mappings and redirects the request to the appropriate subdirectory on the registered domain server.

There is no language in the cited passage that discloses mapping the old URL to a new URL based on a data owner specified mapping. Neither is there any language in the cited passage that discloses mapping the old URL to a new URL based on a data owner specified mapping accessible from the CGI script. Thus, Choudhry does not disclose all of the limitations of claims 1, and thus Choudhry does not anticipate claims 1. M.P.E.P. §2131.

In response to Applicants' above arguments, the Office Action states that Choudhry discloses a network administrator, or "webmaster," that is responsible for the manual configuration and maintenance of records and therefore concludes that Choudhry in light of paragraphs [0018, 0020 and 0044] discloses the above-cited claim limitation. Office Action (2/21/2008), page 2. Applicants respectfully traverse.

Choudhry instead discloses that if the owner of the subdomain desires, a separate subnetwork may be established with a separate subdomain server, and the routing tables on the domain server are updated to reflect a "pass through" routing to the new subdomain server. [0018]. Choudhry further discloses that the routing tables for domains, subdomains, sub-subdomains, etc., are typically implemented as simple text files stored on the disk subsystem of the various servers, such as the disk subsystems (7 and 3) shown in Figure 1. [0019]. Choudhry additionally discloses that to promote the easy interchange and exchange of routing definitions, RFC1033 defines standard formats for a record ("resource record") for each domain name and subdomain name, and recommends that these be stored in flat text files on each domain server's disk subsystem. [0019]. Furthermore, Choudhry discloses that a

network administrator, or "webmaster", is responsible for the manual configuration and maintenance of these records. [0020].

Hence, Choudhry discloses that the routing tables may be updated to reflect that a subdomain is hosted on a server ("subdomain server") other than the domain server. Further, Choudhry discloses that the record for each domain name and subdomain name ("resource records") are manually configured and maintained by a network administrator or webmaster.

There is no basis for the Office Action to conclude that Choudhry discloses mapping the old URL to a new URL based on a data owner specified mapping accessible from the CGI script. Instead, the Office Action points to passages in Choudhry that discloses hosting a subdomain server on a server other than the domain server as well as manually configuring and maintaining resource records by a network administrator or webmaster. The Office Action must provide a basis in fact and/or technical reasoning to support the assertion that Choudhry discloses mapping the old URL to a new URL based on a data owner specified mapping accessible from the CGI script. *Ex parte Levy*, 17 U.S.P.Q.2d 1461, 1464 (Bd. Pat. App. & Inter. 1990). Thus, Choudhry does not disclose all of the limitations of claims 1, and thus Choudhry does not anticipate claims 1. M.P.E.P. §2131.

Claims 2-6 each recite combinations of features of independent claim 1, and hence claims 2-6 are not anticipated by Choudhry for at least the above-stated reasons that claim 1 is not anticipated by Choudhry.

Claims 2-6 recite additional features, which, in combination with the features of the claims upon which they depend, are not anticipated by Choudhry.

For example, Choudhry does not disclose "parsing said old URL to identify a higher level URL in said old URL, and using said higher level URL to determine that said old URL is associated with said CGI script " as recited in claim 3. The Office Action cites paragraph [0021] of Choudhry as disclosing the above-cited claim limitation. Office Action (2/21/2008), page 5. Applicants respectfully traverse.

Choudhry instead discloses setting up the new domain server and/or the new zone file. [0021].

There is no language in the cited passage that teaches parsing the old URL to identify a higher level URL in the old URL. Instead, Choudhry discloses that the script on the virtual subdomain server (54) parses the requested URL for the domain and subdomain names. [0043]. For instance, in the example "(http://www.sub.domain.com)," the domain name is "domain" and the virtual subdomain name is "sub." [0043]. Choudhry further discloses that the virtual domain name server then queries a database (55) for a mapping to a subdirectory for the virtual subdomain. [0043]. Neither is there any language in the cited passage that discloses using the higher level URL to determine that the old URL is associated with the CGI script. Thus, Choudhry does not disclose all of the limitations of claim 3, and thus Choudhry does not anticipate claim 3. M.P.E.P. §2131.

The Office Action further cites paragraph [0024] of Choudhry as disclosing "wherein said step of passing said old URL to said associated CGI script comprises the step of using a redirect directive in a web server configuration file on said web server" as recited in claim 4. Office Action (2/21/2008), page 5. Applicants respectfully traverse.

Choudhry instead discloses that some form of traffic engineering should be done to estimate the impact of adding a particular subdomain to the current name server with respect to the additional traffic or number of "hits" it will receive. [0024].

Hence, Choudhry discloses estimating the impact of adding a particular subdomain to the current name server with respect to the additional traffic or number of "hits" it will receive.

There is no language in the cited passage that discloses using a redirect directive in a web server configuration file on the web server. Neither is there any language in the cited passage that discloses using a redirect directive in a web server configuration file on the web server in connection with passing the old URL to the associated CGI script. Thus, Choudhry does not disclose all of the limitations of claim 4, and thus Choudhry does not anticipate claim 4. M.P.E.P. §2131.

The Office Action further cites paragraph [0018] of Choudhry as disclosing "associating a message with at least one data owner specified mapping of an old URL to a new URL" as recited in claim 5. Office Action (2/21/2008), page 5. Applicants respectfully traverse.

Choudhry instead discloses that virtual subdomains are special cases of subdomains, which may or may not actually refer to a separate subdomain server from the domain server, but may refer to a directory or other software facility on the domain server. [0018]. Choudhry further discloses that this is referred to as "hosting" the subdomain on the domain server. [0018].

Hence, Choudhry discloses hosting the subdomain on the domain server.

There is no language in the cited passage that discloses associating a message with at least one data owner. Neither is there any language in the cited passage that discloses associating a message with at least one data owner specified mapping of an old URL to a new URL. Thus, Choudhry does not disclose all of the limitations of claim 5, and thus Choudhry does not anticipate claim 5. M.P.E.P. §2131.

Additionally, the Office Action cites paragraph [0044] of Choudhry as disclosing "outputting said associated message to said web browser" as recited in claim 6. Applicants respectfully traverse.

Choudhry instead discloses that a Common Gateway Interface ("CGI") script (502) is used to transmit forms to the web browser (504) via the Internet connection (503) between the virtual subdomain management server (501) and the user's web browser. [0044]. Choudhry further discloses that the forms allow the web browser user to select the name for his or her new virtual subdomain, to enter the domain name with subdirectory to which requests for the virtual subdomain should be redirected, and any other user information necessary to establish an account such as name, e-mail address, billing address, telephone number, etc. [0044].

Hence, Choudhry discloses forms allowing the web browser user to select the name for his/her new virtual subdomain, to enter the domain name with subdirectory

to which requests for the virtual subdomain should be redirected, and any other user information necessary to establish an account.

There is no language in the cited passage that discloses outputting the associated message to the web browser. Thus, Choudhry does not disclose all of the limitations of claim 6, and thus Choudhry does not anticipate claim 6. M.P.E.P. §2131.

As a result of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully assert that not each and every claim limitation was found within Choudhry, and thus claims 1-6 are not anticipated by Choudhry. M.P.E.P. §2131.

V. CONCLUSION:

As a result of the foregoing, it is asserted by Applicants that claims 1-6 in the Application are in condition for allowance, and Applicants respectfully request an allowance of such claims. Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner call Applicants' attorney at the below listed number if the Examiner believes that such a discussion would be helpful in resolving any remaining issues.

Respectfully submitted,

WINSTEAD P.C.

Attorneys for Applicants

By: 

Robert A. Voigt, Jr.

Reg. No. 47,159

P.O. Box 50784
Dallas, TX 75201
(512) 370-2832

Austin_1 532341v.1